

EFFECT OF TIDE ON FLOOD MODELLING AND MAPPING IN KOTA  
TINGGI

AHMAD ZUHDI BIN ISMAIL

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the  
requirements for the award of the degree of  
Master of Engineering (Hydraulics and Hydrology)

Faculty of Civil Engineering  
Universiti Teknologi Malaysia

MARCH 2015

**To my beloved family and friends,  
Thank you for your encouragements and supports.**

**To my dear supervisor and co-supervisor,  
Thank you for your helps and advices.**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

First and foremost, I would like to express my sincerest gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Zulkifli Yusop and Co supervisor Mrs. Zainab Mohamad Yusof for their worthwhile guidance throughout this study. Their wide knowledge and their unique way of thinking have been of great value for me. Their invaluable comments, kind consideration, encouragement and supports have provided a good basis for the present thesis. My sincere appreciation is extended to my lecturers in Hydrology and Hydraulics Department, Mr. Kamarul Azlan and Dr. Tarmizi for their advice and comments. My earnest gratitude goes to my Flagship team, Dr. Askari, Dr. Fadilah, Dr. Arien and all team members in UTM for their precious time and patience in sharing their knowledge, experience and wisdom which led to the completion of this project. Last but not least, my utmost regards are sent to all of my family members especially my beloved parents who have supported me throughout my academic years. My warmest appreciation to all of my friends for their moral support on contributes to the success of this project. Above all, I'm grateful of Allah who makes this journey true.

## **ABSTRACT**

This study aimed at mapping the Kota Tinggi flood in 2006/07 that had caused massive damages to properties and the environment. The flood was associated with unusually high intensity and continuous rainfall. Therefore, a reliable technique of floodplain mapping is crucial for the improvement of flood control strategies and preparing an evacuation plan. The main objective of this study is to compare the effect of tide on flood modelling analysis. The inundated areas were mapped for various annual recurrent intervals (ARIs) using peak flow data from July 1965 to Jun 2010. The study used Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data for flood modelling. HEC-HMS, HEC-RAS, and HEC-GeoRAS were used to develop the flood modelling. The results reaffirm that the GEV model is the best for fitting the annual flood. The HEC-HMS hydrologic model was calibrated and validated using observed hydrographs in September 2002 and January 2003, respectively. Upon successful calibration and validation, the model was used to simulate flood hydrograph in January 2007. The modelling took into account tidal effect. When tidal effect was not considered, the simulated flood depth was 43 % lower than the observed flood. However, the inclusion of tidal effect has reduced the simulation error with average similarity of 91.4%. The simulation results show that the river flow starts to over bank for ARIs exceeded 25 year.

## ABSTRAK

Kajian ini bertujuan untuk memeta dan memodelkan banjir di Kota Tinggi pada tahun 2006/07 yang telah mengakibatkan kerosakan besar pada harta benda dan alam sekitar. Banjir ini disebabkan keamatan hujan yang tinggi dan berterusan. Oleh itu, teknik pemetaan banjir adalah penting dalam menambahbaik strategi kawalan banjir dan menyediakan pelan pemindahan. Objektif utama kajian ini ialah untuk membandingkan kesan pasang surut air ke atas pemodelan banjir. Kawasan banjir telah dipetakan dalam pelbagai tahun kala kembali dengan menggunakan data aliran puncak dari Julai 1965 hingga Jun 2010. Kajian ini menggunakan data Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) bagi pemodelan banjir. Perisian HEC-HMS, HEC-RAS, dan HEC-GeoRAS telah digunakan bagi membangunkan model pemetaan banjir. Analisis frekuensi mengesahkan bahawa model GEV adalah yang terbaik berdasarkan ujian GOF, dan sesuai digunakan bagi menentukan nilai ARI. Model HEC-HMS telah dikalibrasi dan divalidasi, masing-masing menggunakan hidrograf cerapan bulan September 2002 dan Januari 2003. Setelah proses kalibrasi dan validasi, model ini telah diguna bagi mensimulasi hidrograf banjir pada Januari 2007. Model banjir telah mengambil kira kesan air pasang surut. Tanpa mengambil kira kesan pasang surut, hasil simulasi telah berkurang anggar sebanyak 43% daripada data cerapan. Dengan kesan pasang surut diambil kira, ralat pemodelan dapat dikurangkan dengan peratus kesamaan sebanyak 91.4%. Keputusan simulasi menunjukkan bahawa aliran sungai mula melimpahi tebing untuk ARI melebihi 25 tahun.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

| CHAPTER | TITLE                                     | PAGE |
|---------|---|------|
|         | <b>DECLARATION</b>                        | ii   |
|         | <b>DEDICATION</b>                         | iii  |
|         | <b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENT</b>                    | iv   |
|         | <b>ABSTRACT</b>                           | v    |
|         | <b>ABSTRAK</b>                            | vi   |
|         | <b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>                  | vii  |
|         | <b>LIST OF TABLES</b>                     | x    |
|         | <b>LIST OF FIGURES</b>                    | xii  |
|         | <b>LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS</b>              | xiii |
|         | <b>LIST OF SYMBOLS</b>                    | xvi  |
|         | <b>LIST OF APPENDICES</b>                 | xvii |
|         | <br>                                      |      |
|         | <b>INTRODUCTION</b>                       | 1    |
|         | 1.1 Introduction                          | 1    |
|         | 1.2 Problem Statement                     | 3    |
|         | 1.3 Purpose and Objectives of Study       | 4    |
|         | 1.4 Scope of Study                        | 4    |
|         | 1.5 Importance of the Study               | 4    |
|         | 1.6 Structure of Thesis                   | 5    |
| 2       | <b>CHAPTER 2</b>                          | 6    |
|         | <b>LITERATURE REVIEW</b>                  | 6    |
|         | 2.1 Introduction                          | 6    |
|         | 2.2 Historical of Floods                  | 6    |
|         | 2.2.1 Historical of 2006/07 Flood Episode | 7    |

|        |  |    |
|--------|--|----|
| 2.3    | Frequency Analysis Model for ARI's                     | 11 |
| 2.4    | Review of Hydrologic Models                            | 12 |
| 2.5    | Flood Modelling  | 19 |
| 2.5.1  | Tidal Flooding   | 20 |
| 2.6    | HEC-HMS and HEC-RAS                                    | 22 |
| 3      | RESEARCH METHODOLOGY                                   | 24 |
| 3.1    | Introduction   | 24 |
| 3.2    | General Methodology                                    | 25 |
| 3.3    | Topography of Johor River Basin                        | 27 |
| 3.4    | Digital Elevation Model (DEM)                          | 31 |
| 3.5    | GIS Analysis for Hydrological modelling                | 34 |
| 3.6    | Methodology of Frequency Analysis for Return Period    | 35 |
| 3.6.1  | Statistical Flood Distribution Model                   | 36 |
| 3.7    | Selection of Model Distribution                        | 37 |
| 3.7.1  | The Goodness of Fit Test (GOF)                         | 40 |
| 3.7.2  | Quantile Estimation of GEV in ARI                      | 41 |
| 3.8    | Hydrological Model Development                         | 43 |
| 3.8.1  | Hydrological Modelling                                 | 44 |
| 3.8.2  | Model Calibration and Validation                       | 50 |
| 3.8.3  | Hydrological Losses                                    | 50 |
| 3.8.4  | Soils Moisture Accounting (SMA)                        | 51 |
| 3.8.5  | Metrological Hyetograph                                | 57 |
| 3.8.6  | Precipitation and Discharge Gages                      | 58 |
| 3.8.9  | Model efficiency                                       | 60 |
| 3.8.10 | Routed Flow from Rantau Panjang Gauging to Kota Tinggi | 61 |
| 3.9    | Routed Flow from Rantau Panjang Gauging to Kota Tinggi | 63 |
| 3.9.9  | Harmonic of Tidal Cycle at Johor River Estuary         | 67 |
| 3.9.2  | Hydrodynamic Channel Flow                              | 70 |
| 3.10   | Flood Mapping with HEC-GeoRAS Model                    | 71 |
| 3.11   | Conclusion   | 75 |
| 4      | RESULT AND DISCUSSION                                  | 76 |

|       |   |     |
|-------|---|-----|
| 4.1   | Introduction  | 76  |
| 4.2   | Flood Distribution Model  | 77  |
| 4.3   | Hydrologic Analysis   | 82  |
| 4.3.1 | Model Calibration   | 84  |
| 4.3.2 | Model Validation  | 85  |
| 4.3.3 | Simulation of 2006/07 Flood Event   | 86  |
| 4.3.4 | Routed Flow from Rantau Panjang to Kota Tinggi Town                       | 87  |
| 4.4   | Tidal Effect on Flood Modelling   | 89  |
| 4.5   | 1D Water Level Simulation for 2006/07 Flood Event                         | 94  |
| 4.5.1 | Kota Tinggi Flood Mapping for 2006/07 Flood Event                         | 95  |
| 4.6   | Comparison flood mapping with previous studies                            | 100 |
| 4.7   | Flood Evidence and Flood Mark for 2007 Event                              | 102 |
| 4.8   | 2D Water Level Simulation for Various ARI                                 | 105 |
| 4.9   | Results of flood maps for 25, 50, and 100 Return Period with Tidal Effect | 107 |
| 5     | CONCLUSION  | 111 |
| 5.1   | Conclusion  | 111 |
| 5.2   | Recommendations   | 112 |
| 7.0   | APPENDIX  | 122 |



## LIST OF TABLES

| <b>TABLE NO.</b> | <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>PAGE</b> |
|------------------|--|-------------|
| Table 2.1:       | Four Days Total Rainfall and Average Monthly During the first<br>Flood Wave at Kota Tinggi         | 10          |
| Table 2.2:       | Total Rainfall in four days and Average Monthly during the<br>second wave                          | 10          |
| Table 2.3:       | The summary of common distribution models for flood frequency<br>analysis                          | 11          |
| Table 2.4:       | Important features of four selected hydrological models.   | 13          |
| Table 2.5:       | Comparison matrix of the models reviewed (Krause et al.,<br>2005).                                 | 17          |
| Table 3.1:       | The general concept of the study.  | 24          |
| Table 3.2:       | Area of 24 Sub-catchment in Johor River Basin  | 28          |
| Table 3.3:       | The Annual Maximum Discharge from 1965 to 2010   | 36          |
| Table 3.4:       | The percentages of aerial rainfall for each of sub catchment.                                      | 47          |
| Table 3.5:       | The List of Rainfall Station for Hydrological Modelling.   | 48          |
| Table 3.6:       | The Formula for MRE and ME in Calibration and Validation of<br>Model                               | 61          |
| Table 3.7:       | The Resulted of Model Efficiency of Calibration Model  | 61          |
| Table 4.1:       | Descriptive statistics of annual flood between 1965 and 2010 at<br>Rantau Panjang gauging station. | 78          |
| Table 4.2:       | Fitting results for probability distribution of annual flood                                       | 78          |
| Table 4.3:       | Goodness-of-fit test ranking for various distributions of annual<br>flood.                         | 79          |
| Table 4.4:       | The simulated and observed peak flow for selected storm<br>events                                  | 82          |
| Table 4.5:       | Optimized model parameter values for soils moisture accounting<br>technique in HEC-HMS             | 83          |
| Table 4.6:       | Statistical calculation to find model efficiency for calibration                                   | 84          |
| Table 4.7:       | Statistical calculation to find model efficiency for Validation                                    | 85          |

Table 4.8: The percentage differences between observed and simulated  
inundated area at Kota Tinggi town during the January 2007  
Flood Event. 104

## LIST OF FIGURES

| <b>FIGURE NO.</b> | <b>TITLE</b>   | <b>PAGE</b> |
|-------------------|--|-------------|
| Figure 2.1:       | Historical flood events at Kota Tinggi town.   | 8           |
| Figure 2.2:       | The Rainfall Intensity over Johor on 19 Dec 2006 and 12<br>January 2007  | 9           |
| Figure 2.3:       | General concept for high tide phenomena ( <a href="http://www.uscusa.org">www.uscusa.org</a> ).                                  | 21          |
| Figure 3.1:       | The general methodology in the study   | 26          |
| Figure 3.2:       | The 24 sub-catchment in Johor River basin.   | 29          |
| Figure 3.3:       | The 11 lumped sub-catchment in Johor River basin   | 30          |
| Figure 3.4 :      | The landuse cover for Johor river basin (Forest: Darker green;<br>Residential: Orange; Vegetation: Light green; Water:<br>Blue). | 31          |
| Figure 3.5:       | The DEM of LiDAR data for Kota Tinggi Town (Red Dash<br>Box).  | 32          |
| Figure 3.6:       | The DEM data removed from manmade features.  | 33          |
| Figure 3.7:       | Example of AB Cross Section Profile at Kota Tinggi Town  | 33          |
| Figure 3.8:       | River cross section derived from LiDAR data  | 34          |
| Figure 3.9:       | The Methodology of Frequency Analysis in this study  | 35          |
| Figure 3.10:      | The Methodology of Frequency Analysis in this study  | 43          |
| Figure 3.11:      | The Location of Rainfall stations (Tringle) and Rantau Panjang<br>Gauging station (Star).  | 46          |
| Figure 3.12:      | The 11-sub catchments for Rantau Panjang Catchment.  | 49          |
| Figure 3.13:      | The Study used SMA for Losses Method in HEC-HMS  | 51          |
| Figure 3.14:      | Conceptual model of continuous Soils Moisture Accounting<br>technique in HEC-HMS (UNEP, 1991)                                    | 52          |
| Figure 3.15:      | Element parameter and method setup in HEC-HMS software   | 53          |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Figure 3.16: The interface of HEC-HMS for loss parameter in this study  | 54 |
| Figure 3.17: The transformation method parameter in HEC-HMS   | 56 |
| Figure 3.18: The Options Used in Baseflow method in HEC-HMS   | 56 |
| Figure 3.19: The baseflow parameter in HEC-HMS software.  | 57 |
| Figure 3.20: Monthly Average for Evapotranspiration in Johor River<br>basin.                                    | 57 |
| Figure 3.21: The Rainfall Pattern on September 2002.  | 58 |
| Figure 3.22: The Hydrograph Pattern on September 2002.  | 59 |
| Figure 3.23: The Rainfall Pattern on January 2003.  | 59 |
| Figure 3.24: The Hydrograph Pattern on January 2003.  | 60 |
| Figure 3.25: Routing Model from Rantau Panjang Gauging to Kota Tinggi<br>Town.                                  | 62 |
| Figure 3.26: General Methodology for Hydraulic Modelling  | 63 |
| Figure 3.27: The geometry model setup in HEC-RAS at Kota Tinggi   | 65 |
| Figure 3.28: Shows the cross section editor in HEC-RAS.   | 65 |
| Figure 3.29: The cross section of AB in the geometry model in HEC-RAS   | 66 |
| Figure 3.30: Boundary condition setup for upstream (RS: 9302.79) and<br>downstream (RS: 111.4218) in HEC-RAS.   | 67 |
| Figure 3.31: Tide level input data in HEC-RAS   | 68 |
| Figure 3.32: Observed Tidal Cycle between 11 December 2006 and 20<br>January 2007 at the estuary of Johor River | 69 |
| Figure 3.33: The framework of flood modelling in HEC-GeoRAS,<br>(Infowork, 2000).                               | 72 |
| Figure 3.34: The maximum extended flooded area at Kota Tinggi as<br>modelled by HEC-GeoRAS.                     | 73 |
| Figure 3.35: Concept design of Shallow Water.   | 74 |
| Figure 3.36: Two-dimensional hydraulic model representations of water<br>velocity from Hec-GeoRAS model.        | 74 |
| Figure 4.1: The annual peak flow at Rantau Panjang gauging station from<br>1965 to 2010.                        | 77 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Figure 4.2: Probability difference plotted on Lognormal, Pearson 5, Gamma, Weibull and GEV distributions  | 80 |
| Figure 4.3: P-P plots of Lognormal, Pearson 5, Gamma, Weibull and GEV distributions   | 81 |
| Figure 4.4: Observed and calibrated hydrographs in September 2002   | 84 |
| Figure 4.5: Validated and observed hydrograph for flood event in January 2003   | 85 |
| Figure 4.6: The simulated and observed hydrograph data from 19 <sup>th</sup> December 2006 to 23 <sup>rd</sup> January 2007                           | 86 |
| Figure 4.7: Comparison between the routed flow at Kota Tinggi town and the simulated hydrograph at the upstream Rantau Panjang                        | 88 |
| Figure 4.8: Cross Section A to B in 1D Flood Modelling  | 89 |
| Figure 4.9: Simulated fFlood level with tidal effect at cross section AB  | 90 |
| Figure 4.10: Simulated flood level without tidal effect at cross section AB   | 91 |
| Figure 4.11: Inundated area during the 2006/07 flood event with tidal effect  | 92 |
| Figure 4.12: Inundated area during the 2006/07 flood event when tide was not considered   | 92 |
| Figure 4.13: The differences in inundated area at Kota Tinggi during the 2006/07 flood event with (red) and without (cream) considering tidal effect. | 93 |
| Figure 4.14: The 2D cross section profile for peak flow at 1 <sup>st</sup> wave in December 2006 flood event at Kota Tinggi.                          | 94 |
| Figure 4.15: The 2D cross section profile for peak flow at second wave in December 2006 flood event at Kota Tinggi.                                   | 94 |
| Figure 4.16: The simulated inundated areas as the floods progress and recede during the first flood wave in December 2006                             | 96 |
| Figure 4.17: The simulated inundated areas as the floods progress and recede during the second wave in January 2007                                   | 98 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Figure 4.18: Additional flooded area in January 2007 (red) compared to<br>flood coverage in Dec 2006 (cream) | 99  |
| Figure 4.19: Flood maps results for January 2007 flood event in comparison<br>with Nik (2007).               | 101 |
| Figure 4.20: The location of flood marks (triangle) for the 2007 flood<br>event.                             | 103 |
| Figure 4.21: The Relationship of Observed and Simulated Water Level for<br>January 2007 Flood Event.         | 105 |
| Figure 4.22: Simulated water levels for various ARIs (Kota Tinggi<br>town).                                  | 106 |
| Figure 4.23: Inundated area for 25 ARI   | 107 |
| Figure 4.24: Inundated area for 50 ARI   | 108 |
| Figure 4.25: Inundated area for 100 ARI  | 109 |
| Figure 4.26: Inundated area for 200 ARI  | 110 |

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

|       |   |                                       |
|-------|---|---------------------------------------|
| ARI   | - | Average Recurrent Interval            |
| CDF   | - | Cumulative Distribution Function      |
| DEM   | - | Digital Elevation Model               |
| DID   | - | Department of Irrigation and Drainage |
| EAP   | - | Emergency Action Plan                 |
| GEV   | - | General Extreme Value                 |
| GIS   | - | Geographical Information System       |
| GOF   | - | Goodness of Fit Test                  |
| K-S   | - | Kolomogorov-Sminov                    |
| LiDAR | - | Light Detection and Ranging           |
| MASMA | - | Manual Saliran Mesra Alam             |
| PDF   | - | Probability Density Function          |
| SMA   | - | Soil Moisture Accounting              |
| SWMM  | - | Storm Water Management Model          |
| U-H   | - | Unit Hydrograph                       |

# LIST OF SYMBOLS

|          |   |                                 |
|----------|---|---------------------------------|
| $Q_p$    | - | Flood Peak Flow                 |
| $Q_v$    | - | Flood Volume                    |
| $Q_d$    | - | Flood Distribution              |
| $n$      | - | Manning's roughness coefficient |
| $d$      | - | Depth of Flood                  |
| $V$      | - | Velocity of Flood Water         |
| $k$      | - | Continues Shape                 |
| $\sigma$ | - | Continues Scale                 |
| $\mu$    | - | Continues Location              |
| $T_c$    | - | Time of Concentration           |
| $T_r$    |   | Return Period                   |



## LIST OF APPENDICES

- |            |   |   |
|------------|---|---|
| Appendix A | - | Precipitation for Calibration               |
| Appendix B | - | Calibration and Validation Model Efficiency |
| Appendix C | - | Site Verification on Flood Mark             |

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Introduction**

The terms flood or flooding cover a very wide range of phenomena. Flood has been recognised as the number one disaster in many parts of the world causing tremendous damages to properties and the environment and losses of life (Smith and Ward, 1998). Globally, in 1980, there were at least 60 major flood disasters and each involving losses of more than 1000 lives (Bates et al., 1997). The phenomena occurred mainly in Asia and South America (UNEP, 1991). The modification of terrain or contour could pose severe damage to Natural River. Moreover, with global warming, the rate of sea level rise is expected to be higher in the future (Nijland, 2005).

Future rainfall is also predicted to be more intense and would result in increasing flood peak, flood volume and duration. Over the past few years, there is evidence of increase rainfall intensity and coupled with large impervious area has

resulted in more extreme and frequent flood occurrence (Knebl et al., 2002). Flooding is an inevitable phenomenon, which can contribute to an extreme and diverse impact such as destruction to human lives, property, and livestock. Therefore, flood simulation is important in order to estimate the present and future floods.

Hydrology and hydraulics modelling needs reliable data for model calibration and validation. There are about 200 rivers system in Malaysia, 150 in Peninsular and the rest in Sabah and Sarawak. The major floods were recorded in Malaysia in 1926, 1931, 1947, 1957, 1967, 1971, 1973, 1979, 1983, 1995, 1998, 2003, and 2005 (Abdullah, 2006) and most recently in December 2014 which caused tremendous damages especially in Kelantan and Pahang. The January 1971 flood that hit Kuala Lumpur and many other states had resulted in a loss of more than RM 200 million and 61 deaths (Yatim, 2012). The flood in Johor (2006/07) was due to “abnormally” heavy rainfall events. The estimated total lost due to this disasters was RM 1.5 billion and RM 237.1 million was for damaged infrastructure alone (Yatim, 2012). It was classified as the highest cost of flood events in Malaysia.

Flood phenomena that are often estimated with simplified assumptions, and parsimonious models may not be able to accurately assess the complex hydrodynamic processes such as tidal effect in river (Chihao et al., 2009). Flood simulation is important in order to estimate the present and future floods. Hydrologic and hydraulics modelling needs reliable parameter data for model calibration and validation. HEC-RAS is one of the most widely used models. It has been tested in analysing hydraulic characteristic of rivers. This model computes water surface profiles and energy grade lines in 2-D, unsteady-state, and gradually varied flow analyses. Once the model structure and order have been identified, the parameters and characteristics of the model can be estimated, calibrated, and validated in some manner (Malcom, 2007).

Johor river basin covers 6319 km<sup>2</sup>, lies in the eastern part of Johor state. The basin is exposed to the northeast trade wind which brings heavy rain in the months of November to March (Nachtnebel et al., 2007). The average rainfall is 2,470 mm per year. Kota Tinggi is a district in Johor State. The distance between Kota Tinggi town to Rantau Panjang gauging station is about 12 km along the river alignment. The area

upstream of this station is about 3489 km<sup>2</sup>, which consists of agriculture, business and mining activities. In 2006/07 flood event, Kota Tinggi was drowned into a massive flood and became one of the highly adverse floods in Malaysia. The region experienced two huge flood events in late 2006 and early 2007 with the observed total rainfall about 400 mm within 3 days (Shafie et al., 2007).

Thus, the present analysis develops 2D flood mapping using hydrodynamics model. In the meantime, 2D numerical hydraulic models are considered advanced enough for the prediction of flood extent, depth, and flow velocities (Bates et al., 1997; Penton and Overton, 2007).

## 1.2 Problem Statement

The floods at Kota Tinggi in December 2006 and January 2007 have caused heavy damages to business and local infrastructures. A total of 11,724 victims in 2006 flood event and 7,915 victims in January 2007 were evacuated (Yatim et al., 2012). This problem is expected to recur year after year. Researchers and modellers had critically discussed about formulating integrated flood mitigation to reduce short term and long-term problems.

Currently there is an increasing interest to develop a new hydrodynamic model in order to achieve better flood modelling results in terms of visualization and characterization. The purpose of this formulation is to incorporate the concept of storm water management, comprising best mix strategies using both structural and non-structural measures. The integration of floodplain and storm water management simulation becomes important in giving new dimension on detecting flood events and handling unexpected events such as bund breach, or failure of flood and detention facilities.

High or spring tide may aggravate flood problems. The effect may cause serious damage compare to normal flood. As mentioned above, flood mapping at Kota Tinggi town is important to predict the possibility of flood occurrences and formulate emergency action plan (EAP), insurance policy and in development planning. a major planning tool to solve the problems and to achieve the objectives of this study.

### **1.3 Purpose and Objectives of Study**

This study concerned with developing appropriate method for flood mapping. In doing that, the following specific objectives are outlined:

1. To estimate the average recurrent interval (ARI) of annual flood using flood frequency analysis.
2. To examine the effect of tide on the flood modelling results.
3. To map the 2006/07 flood and the simulated floods for 25, 50, 100 and 200 year return periods.

### **1.4 Scope of Study**

The study area was in Johor River catchment. The catchment area was selected because it is prone to flood and the availability of data. In this study, hydrology and GIS data for modelling and analysis, such as landuse, river catchment, river profile, rainfall, and stream flow were compiled, corrected, and validated. For frequency analysis models, Log Pearson 5, GEV, Lognormal, and Weibull were used. In order to perform goodness of fit test for determining the best distribution model for peak flow, Kolmogov-Smirnov (K-S) test was used. Then, the return period was calculated based on the best fitted model. The peakflows for 25, 50, 100, and 200 ARIs were then predicted. The hydrographs were modelled using HEC-HMS software and the flood mapping used HEC-RAS. The boundary condition was simulated into two options, which considered two conditions, with tidal and without tidal effect. In addition, HEC-GeoRAS was used to simulate the floodplain in 1D model and 2D model using LiDAR data.

### **1.5 Importance of the Study**

The study provides knowledge and understanding of the used of HEC-HMS, HEC-RAS, and HEC-GeoRAS software for hydrological and flood modelling. The

study helps in understanding the components and characteristics of tidal on flood modelling. Thus, throughout this study, the information of flood maps, flood depth, and flood extend can be determined for flood forecasting. In additional, local authorities could have a better planning for flood mitigation, and flood evacuation strategies.

## 1.6 Structure of Thesis

The structure of thesis consists of five chapters as follows;

Chapter 1 introduces background of the study area, problem definition related to flood modelling, objectives, scopes and the important of study.

Chapter 2 discusses past research related to flood modelling. The literature highlight flood history in Malaysia, especially at Kota Tinggi. Various techniques of frequency analysis for estimating peakflow of several of ARIs are discussed. The literature review also include application of Hydrological and Hydraulic models for flood modelling. The effects of tide on flood modelling results are also discussed.1

Chapter 3 explains the methodology used in the study. These include describing the study catchment, application of digital elevation model, frequency analysis, hydrological modelling, hydraulic modelling, and lastly flood mapping.

Chapter 4 presents the results of the study. The main results discussed are on frequency analysis, the modelling of hydrograph and flood mapping.

Chapter 5 concludes the study results in relation to the study objectives. Recommendations for future study are also presented.

## REFERENCES

- Aaron, C., Verikatesh, M., (2009). Effect of topographic data, geometric configuration, and modelling approach on flood inundation mapping, *Journal of Environment Engineering*, 23: 123-125.
- Al-Sabhan, W., Mulligan, M., Blackbur, G.A., (2003). A real-time hydrological model for flood prediction using GIS and the WWW. *Journal of Environment and Computer Urban System* 27: 9-32.
- Alexender, S.M., (1993). Visual Interactive Fitting of Beta Distribution. *Journal of Engineering and Management ASCE*, 177(4), 589-605.
- Ahmad, U.N., A., Shabri, Z.A., Zakaria, (2011). Flood frequency analysis of maximum stream flows using L-Moments and TL-Moments Approach. *Applied Mathematic Science*. 5(5): 243-253.
- Ahens, S.R., Maidment, D.r., (1999). Flood Forecasting for the Buffalo Bayou using CRWE-PrePro and HEC-HMS (CRWR Report 99-6). Center for Research in Water Resource, Austin, Texas.
- Anderson, M. L., Chen, Z. -Q., Kavvas, M.L., Feldman, A., (2002). Coupling HEC-HMS with atmospheric models for prediction of watershed runoff, *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering* 7 (4), 31-318.
- Ali, S., Saeed, S., Rezza, M., (2012). Probabilistic flood inundation mapping of ungauged rivers, Linking GIS techniques and frequency analysis. *Journal of Hydrology*, 458, 68-86.
- Anrysiak, P. B., (2000). Visual Floodplain Modelling with GIS. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin , *Urban Water*, 13: 23-28.

- Bates, P.P., Horith, M.S., C.N., and Mason, D.C., (1997). Integrating remote sensing observation of flood hydrology and hydraulic modelling. Hydraulically process, *Journal of Environment Engineering*, 11, 1777-1795.
- Baker, T.U., and Gruewald, H.T., (2003). Hale, J., 2003. Urban flood routing, the next step. WaPUG, Autumn Conference, Blackpool, UK.
- Bedient, P. B., Holder, A., Benavides, J.A., Vieux, B.E., (2003). Radar-based flood warning system applied to tropical storm Allison. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering* 8 (6), 308-31.
- Beker, A., Grunewald, U., (2003). Flood risk in central Europe. *Water Research Science*, 300 (5622): 1099.
- Bennet, (1998), Development Soil Parameter for Hydrological. University of California 25 (124 - 130).
- Burgees, K., and Reeve, D., (1994). The development of method for assessment of dam defense and risk of flooding, Section 5.3 in a Strategic Approach, 4-6 July, Ministry of Agriculture, London.
- Bobee, B. and P.F., Rasmussen, (1995). Recent advances in flood frequency analysis. *Rev. Geography.*, 33(S2): 1111-1116.
- Bobee, B. G., Cavidas, F., Ashkar, J., Bernier, and Rasmussen P., (1993). Towards a systematic approach to comparing distributions used in flood frequency analysis. *Journal of Hydrology*, 142: 121-136.
- Burrough, (1997). "Flood Inundation Analysis Using Hec-6 and Arcview GIS 3.2a." Technical Report: National Civil Engineering Conference.
- Carson, E.C., (2006). Hydrologic modelling of flood conveyance and impact of historic overbank sedimentation on West Fork Clack's Park, Unite Mountains,



North Eastern Utah, United State of America. *Journal of Geomorphology* 75: 368-383.

Chihao, F., Chun, H.K., Wei, S. W., (2009). An innovative modelling approach using Qual2k and HEC-RAS integration to assess the impact of tidal effect on river water quality simulation, Ming Chi University of Technology, Taiwan.

Chow V. T., (1956), Hydraulic Studies of Floods in the United States Internal. *Association Science Hydrology, Publish. No. 42*, 134-170.

Daniel, H.H., (1989). Computer assisted floodplain hydrology and hydraulics. Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering and the Utah Water Resources Laboratory. Pages: 322-323.

Deni, S.M., and A.A., Jemain, (2009). Fitting the distribution of wet and dry spells with alternative probability models. *Atmosphere Physic.* 104: 13-27.

Djokic, D., Beavers, M.A., and Deshakulakarni, C.K., (1994). "ARC/HEC2: an ARC/INFO - HEC-2 Interface." *Proc. 21th Water Resources Planning and Management Division Annual Specialty Conference, ASCE, New York, N.Y.*, 41-44.

Department of Irrigation and Drainage (DID), (2000). Urban Stormwater Management Manual for Malaysia (MASMA), Volume 4/Chapter 3, Department of Irrigation and Drainage.

Dr. Nik Associate Sdn. Bhd., (2007). Penilaian Kajian Banjir 2006/07 di Kota Tinggi, Johor Darul Takzim.

Flemis, A.W., and Franz, M.A., (1971). Goodness of fit technique. Marcel Decker Inc. New York.

Garrote, L., Bras, R.L., (1995). A distribute model for real time flood forecasting using di digital elevation models. *Journal of Hydrology* 167, 279-306.

- Gary, W.B., (2000). HEC-RAS, River Analysis System Hydraulic Reference Manual, Hydrologic Engineering Center, US Army Corps of Engineering, page: 250
- Gunasekara, T.A.G., and Cunnane, C., (1992). Split sampling technique for selecting a flood frequency analysis procedure. *Journal of Hydrology*. 130: 189-200.
- Handmer, J. (2000), Flood hazard and sustainable development, Floods, London, New York, Parker, D., vol. 2, pp. 276-286.
- Haktanir, T., (1992). Comparison of various flood frequency distributions using annual flood peaks data of rivers in Anatolia. *Journal Hydrology*. 136: 1-31.
- Haktanir, T., and H.B., Horlacher. (1993). Evaluation of various distributions for flood frequency analysis, *Journal Science Hydrology*. 2(1-2): 15-32.
- Hewlett, and Hibbert, (1967). Storm water management model SWMM, Version 4 User's Manual, US Environmental Protection Agency, Athens Georgia, United State of America.
- Karimi, H. A. and Houston, B. J. (1997), Evaluating Strategies for Integrating Environmental Models with GIS: Current Trends and Future Needs. *Hydrological Science Journal*. 48(1): 105-120.
- Krause, P., Boyle D.P., Base, F., (2005). Comparison of different efficiency criteria for hydrological model assessment, *Journal of advances in Geoscience* 5, 89-9
- Knebl, M.R., Yang, Z. L., K. Hutchison, D.R., Maidment, (2002). Regional scale flood modeling using NEXRAD rainfall, GIS, and HEC-HMS/RAS: a case study for the San Antonio River Basin Summer 2002 Storm Event, *Journal of Environment Management* 75- 325-336.

- Lanza, L., Siccardi, F., (1995). The role of GIS as a tools for the assessment of flood hazard at the regional scale. *Geographical Information Systems in Assessing Natural Hazards* 11, 199–217.
- Linsley, R.K., Crawford, N.H., (1960). Computation of a synthetic stream flow record on a digital. *Journal of Geophysical Research* 111:D06105, doi: 10.1029/2005JD005965.
- Lim, Y. H., and Lye, L.M., (2003). Regional flood estimation for ungauged basins in Sarawak, Malaysia. *Hydrological Science Journal*. 48(1): 79-94.
- Mark, O., (2004). Potential and limitations of 1D modelling of urban flooding. *Journal of Water Resources and Planning*, 127: 125-135
- Maidment, D.R., (1993). GIS and Hydrologic Modelling, in *Environmental Modelling with GIS*, ed. by M.F. Goodchild, B.O. Parks, and L.T. Steyaert, Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 147-167.
- Malcom, G. A., Paul, D.B., (2007). Model validation perspective in hydrological, science. University of British, United Kingdom.
- Mitosek, H.T., W.G., Strupczewski, and V.P., Singh, (2002). Toward an objective choice of an annual flood peak distribution. Proceeding of the 5th International Conference on Hydro science and engineering, Published on CR ROM: Advances in Hydro Science and Engineering, Warsaw.
- Mitosek, H.T., and W.G., Strupczewski, (2004). Simulation Results of Discrimination Procedures. Retrieved from: <http://www.igf.edu.pl/>.
- Mohsen, S., Yusop Z., Yusof, F., (2013). Comparison of Distribution Models for Peakflow, Flood Volume and Flood Duration. *Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology* 6(4) 733-738.

- Moraes, (1996). Computation of a synthetic streamflow record on a digital. *Progress in Physical Geography* 29(3):392-410.
- Moore, I., A., Turner, J., Wilson, S., Jenson and Band, (1993). GIS and land surface-subsurface process modelling. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp. 196-230.
- Mcdonnell, Z.K., and Pular, J.K., (2001). Spatial dimension using GIS in Hydrology. *Progress in Physical Geography* 20 (2), 159-177.
- Mutua, F.M., (1994). The use of information criterion in the identification of an optimum flood frequency model. *Hydrology Science*, 39(3): 235-244.
- Nachtnebel, F., lbrech, H.L., Burrough, T., Gristmair, F., (2007). A Review of Real Time Flood Forecasting Methods. CRC for Catchment Hydrology, Report 94/2 Monash University, Melbourne.
- Natale, G. Petaccia , F. Savi & M. Zanotti (2007). “Mapping Of Flood Risk Prone Areas: A Comparison Between Different Models And Techniques.” *Technical Report Geophysical Research Abstracts*, Vol. 9, 06/07.
- Nijland, H.J., (2005). Sustainable development of floodplains (SDF) project,. *Environmental Science & Policy*. 8: 245-252
- Ole, M., (2004). Potential and limitations of 1D modelling of urban flooding, *Journal of Hydrology*. 42: 526–538.
- Pappenberger, F., Beven, K., Horritt, M., Blazkova, S., (2005). Uncertainty in the calibration of effective roughness parameters in HEC-RAS using inundation and downstream level observations. *Journal of Hydrology* 302, 46–69.

- Paperner, B.F., Beven, K., Horitt, M., Blanzkova, S., (2005). Uncertainty in the calibration of effective roughness parameters in HEC-RAS using inundation and downstream level observation. *Journal of Hydrology*, 6(4): 302-469.
- Penton, and Overton, (2007). Spatial Modelling of Floodplain Inundation Combining Satellite Imagery and Elevation Models, CSIRP Land and Water, Australia.
- Rao, A.R., and Hamed, K.H., (2000). Flood Frequency Analysis, Purdue University, *International Journal of Climatology* 29:385-416.
- Robinson, C., Li, C., Barry, D.A., (2007). Effect of Tidal Forcing on a Subterranean Estuary. *Journal of Advance in Water Resources*, 30 : 851-865.
- Pruski T.A., Law A.M., and Kelton, W.D., (1971). Simulation Modelling and Analysis. McGraw –Hill, New York.
- Rosveldt, J. O., (1986). Summary of floods in the United States During 1963, United State Geological Survey. 1830-B
- Robson, (1990). Hydrologic and analysis design, second edition, Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, New Jersey 07458.
- Richard, H., McCuen, (1998). Hydrologic and analysis design, second edition, Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, New Jersey 07458.
- Schultz, H. K., (1993). “Regional Scale Flood Modelling Using Nexrad Rainfall, GIS, And HEC-HMS/RAS: A Case Study For The San Antonio River Basin Summer 2002 Storm Event.” Technical Report: [www.sciencedirect.com](http://www.sciencedirect.com).
- Shafie, A., (2007). Technical report extreme flood. Temporary shelter will be given to flood victims. The Star online. 24 January 2007.

<http://www.weng.colostate.edu/>Atikah Shafie Johor Hock, T. E. and Zolkepli, F., 2007

Shiau, J.T. and Shen, H.W., (2001). Recurrent Analysis of Hydraulic Drought of Differing Severity. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 127: 30-40

Stuart, H.K., and Stocks, K.J., (1993). Application of GIS in Flood Hazard Mapping: A Case Study of Genetic River.” Singapore: Department Of Geography, National University of Singapore.

Suhaila, J., and A.A., Jemain, (2008). Fitting the statistical distribution for daily rainfall in Peninsular Malaysia based on AIC criterion. *Journal Applied Science*, 3: 1027-1036

Smith, K., and Ward, R., (1998). Flood on Physical Processes and Human Impact, *Environmental Science & Policy* Page, 3-12

Sinnakaudan, S., A., Ghani, M.S., Ahmad, N.A., Zakaria, (2001). Integrating GIS with Hydraulic and Sediment Transport Model for Flood Risk Analysis. In Proceedings, R&D Colloquium on River Engineering and Urban Drainage, Penang, Malaysia, 14-15 August.

Takara, K.T., and J.R., Stedinger, (1994). Recent Japanese contributions to frequency analysis and quantile and quantile lower bound estimators. Stochast. *Statistical Method Hydrology Environment Engineering*. 1: 217-234.

Tate, E. C., Olivera, F. & Maidment, D. (1999). “Floodplain Mapping Using HECRAS & Arcview GIS.” Austin: The University Of Texas.

UNEP (1991). Environmental Data Report, 1991 and 1992, United Nation Environment Programmed, Blackwell Oxford. PP-123-210.

- Van Der Sande., Mathel K.L., Vent K.F., (2003). A segmentation and classification approach of IKONOS-2 imagery for land cover mapping to assist flood risk and flood damage assessment, international journal of applied earth observation and geoinformation, Vol.4, pp.217-229.
- Victor M. P., (2010). Rainfall Runoff Engineering, Principle and practices. Center for Inter-Disciplinary Studies of Mountain & Hill Environment.
- Vogel, R.M., W.O., Thomas, and T.A., McMahon, (1993). Flood flow frequency model selection in southeastern United States. *Journal Water Resource Planning Management* 119(3): 353-366.
- Water, D., (2003). Core group on flood protection of the water directors (Europe): Best practices on flood prevention, protection and mitigation, European initiative on flood prevention, (25 September 2003).
- Westen, V., (2007). Geoinformation science and Earth observation municipal risk management: The SLARIM project.: Enschede, The Netherlands, International Institute for the Geoinformation Science and Earth Observation (ITC).
- WMO, World meteorological Organization, (2003). Our future climate (Publication WO-952)
- Yatim, B., M., Abdullah, S. Surif S., (2012). Banjir Besar Johor, Universiti Teknologi Malaysia, ISBN 978-967-472-054-2, Page: 5